

## BEDE

Bede, Anglo-Saxon England's foremost Anglo-Latin author, "father of English scholarship," "father of English history," "teacher of the whole Middle Ages," produced works in every discipline of the monastic school system. His educational treatises—basic schoolbooks and reference works—gave the Anglo-Saxons access to classical authorities and provided early medieval supplements to late antique manuals. His scientific writings on computus and chronology established a new norm. His commentaries on the Bible offered Anglo-Saxon readers a carefully edited and annotated synthesis of patristic sources, particularly the four Fathers of the Western Church. His historical writings formed a model for later historiographers and are still the principal sources, along with the *ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE*, for information on England before the Conquest. By including a fairly complete bibliography of his works at the end of the *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA* (V.xxiv), Bede furnished a list to his readers of writings available for use.

Teacher, exegete, historian, and saintly monk, Bede was cited as "magister," "nostrae cathegita terrae," "se snotera lareow," "breoma bocera," "se trahtnere," "se halga Beda"; both in England and on the Continent he was ranked on a footing with the Fathers of the Church; see BONIFACE (*EHD* 180), CUTHBERT (*EHD* 185), LUL (*EHD* 188), ALCUIN (*MGH ECA* 337.5, 360.16–20, 443.8) and ÆLFRIC (in the Preface to the *FIRST SERIES OF CATHOLIC HOMILIES*, and in his letters to Wulfsgie [*ÆLet* 1, B1.8.1; 16] and to Sigefyrth [*ÆLet* 5, B1.8.5; 209]). Wherever Bede's name was associated with a work, scribes gave the work special attention; see *CCSL* 123A.xv and 185, and *CCSL* 123B.242.

Continental MSS of Bede's works are numerous, but, despite his primary importance for Anglo-Saxon culture, his undoubted influence on writers such as Alfred and Ælfric, and the honor they paid him, insular MSS of his works (except for the *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA* and the *VITA CUTHBERTI*) are relatively few. Bede's work suffered the same fate as many other pre-1100 insular MSS. The Viking invasions and cultural decay brought about general destruction; in addition, his school texts were particularly vulnerable to abuse, hard wear, and eventual discard. Manuscript evidence suggests that most of Bede's works were re-imported into England after the Conquest.

Bede's influence generally permeates the writings of the educated class in Anglo-Saxon England, but it is difficult to establish always when authors are borrowing from him, since sometimes Bede is the intermediary source for a late antique or patristic idea or quotation which they may have gotten directly or from another intermediary, and sometimes authors incorporate material from him in a reworked fashion that conceals the full extent of indebtedness to him. As a rule, if an Anglo-Saxon author undertakes

a topic Bede has written on, Bede is a likely source for at least some of it; it is fruitless to seek Bede in treatments of non-canonical and pseudopigraphal topics.

For a detailed treatment of Bede's life, see G. Brown (1987).

[For this *Trial Version*, only the headnote for one of Bede's didactic works has been included.]

**De orthographia** [BEDA.Orthogr.]: *CPL* 1566.

*MSS* 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 221: HG 69.

2. London, BL Harley 3826: HG 438.

*Lists* none.

*A-S Vers* none.

*Quots/Cits* 1. ALCVIN.Orthogr.: see below.

2. ? BONIFGramm.: see below.

*Refs* none.

George H. Brown

OLD ENGLISH BEDE (*Bede*, B9.6).

*MSS* 1. Cambridge, University Library Kk.3.18: HG 22.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: HG 39.

3. London, BL, Cotton Otho B.xi: HG 357.

4. London, BL, Cotton Domitian ix, fol. 11: HG 330.

5. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (*SC* 9830): HG 668.

6. Oxford, Corpus Christi College 279 part ii: HG 673.

*Lists—A-S Vers* none.

*Quots/Cits* 1. *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 57–58: *Bede* 96.10–11.

2. *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 77–78: *Bede* 96.31–32.

*Refs* *ÆCHom* II.9 (B1.2.10) 7–8.

The Old English *Bede* is a shortened vernacular version of BEDE's *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA*: the translator edits Bede's work, consistently omitting most epitaphs, poems, letters, and other documents, many geographical details, and much historical information about the Church which does not directly affect England; see Whitelock (*GR* 5587, pp 61–62). Excerpts were copied into MS Cotton Domitian ix, fol 11 around 900 (NRK 151). The Tanner MS is from the first quarter of the tenth century (NRK 351). Cot-

ton Otho B.xi, which was later badly burned in the fire of 1731, dates from the mid tenth century (NRK 180); in 1562, Laurence Nowell made a transcription (BL Additional 43703) of the MS. The three other MSS date from the eleventh century. See Whitelock (GR 5587, pp 80–81) for a stemma which implies at least three lost MSS.

Whitelock (GR 5587, p 79 note 10) notes the specific quotations of the Old English translation by ÆLFRIC in his homily on Gregory, and she provides a number of other verbal parallels as well. She asserts that in other places where Ælfric uses Bede's *Historia* the verbal parallels are not convincing enough to claim that he follows the Old English rather than the Latin (p 80 note 18).

At the start of this same homily, Ælfric claims King Alfred translated Bede into the vernacular: "and eac historia anglorum ða ðe Ælfred cyning of ledene on englisc awende" (see Refs above). Although the dates of the surviving MSS do not contradict this theory, Miller's (GR 5549 p xxxiii) assertions about the Mercian dialect — and hence origin — of the work complicate matters considerably. After reassessing the evidence, Whitelock (GR 5587, p 77) concludes that, while there is "no evidence that Alfred took part in the actual translation of Bede," it "remains a probability" that "the work was undertaken at Alfred's instigation." In contrast, Kuhn (GR 5591, pp 172–80) has again argued that Alfred translated the work using "an older Mercian interlinear gloss" late in his career "when renewed invasions of England and the task of carrying out his ambitious domestic programs left the king little leisure for polishing his work" (pp 179–80). The problem of the dialect is apparently again discussed in Waite (1985), a work not yet seen.

Emily Cooney

## BOETHIUS

Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (c. 480–524), member of the Italian senatorial class and, after his father's death, protégé of Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, rose to the rank of consul (510) and reached the peak of his public career in 522 when his two sons were named consuls and he himself became "Master of the Offices." While in this latter post, he became somehow entangled in the political feuding between Theoderic and Justin, emperor in the East (Boethius gives his own account of this in the first Book of the *CONSOLATIO*); in late 523 or early 524 he was ac-

cused of treason by Theoderic, imprisoned at Pavia, and subsequently executed (524/525).

His class and the interests of his patron Symmachus provided him with a milieu suited to his scholarly interests. Adept at Greek, and thoroughly conversant with the then prestigious Neoplatonic schools of Alexandria and Athens, he had absorbed and understood their teaching and educational programs; through an industrious career as translator, commentator and adaptor, he preserved for the Latin West much of the Greek culture and learning of his age, producing works on mathematics, logic and theology and his masterpiece, the *Consolatio philosophiae*. Introductions to his life and works, along with bibliography, can be found in Chadwick (1981) and Gibson (1981).

As is typical in the case of secular texts, evidence that Boethius' works circulated widely begins to appear only in the Carolingian Renaissance. The entire range of Boethius' output had at least some circulation in Anglo-Saxon England; knowledge of the individual works is discussed under four headings: Mathematical, Logical, and Theological Works, and the *Consolation of Philosophy*. [Only a selection has been included in this *Trial Version*.]

## Mathematical Works

**De institutione arithmetica** [BOETH.Arith.]: CPL 879.

MSS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 352: HG 97.

2. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 6401: HG 795.

Lists — Refs none.

*De institutione arithmetica*, an expanding translation of the Greek work by Nichomachus, became a standard text from the time of ALCUIN and was studied by scholars connected with the Carolingian court especially in northern France but also in Germany, France in general, and the Low countries; see White 1981 pp 164–68; Masi's (1983 pp 58–63) very provisional survey of MSS lists 38 copies dating from the ninth through the tenth centuries. The Irish, however, knew the work and quoted it in their computistical texts from the seventh century; see Jones (1939 p 49), and Walsh and Ó Cróinín (1988 p 122). The oldest St Gall catalog (841–72) lists, among some 30 "libri scottice scripti," an "Arithmetica Boetii, volumen I" (Lehmann 1918 p 71); this copy, which does not survive, is likely to have been an early one, belonging to the pre-Benedictine cell, that is pre-750 (Clark 1926 p 25). The knowledge of this work among the Irish, the apparently early copy at St Gall, and the fact that St Gall was a foundation with close ties to

the Columban communities and on the route between Bangor and Bobbio, all make it especially interesting that the earliest fragment of *De institutione arithmetica* known (Turin Bibl. Naz. F.IV.1, an Italian uncial MS from the turn of the seventh century, CLA 4.450) was at Bobbio. It is thus possible that the interest of the Irish in computistical questions, sparked by the Paschal controversies, was instrumental in bringing this work to light and that it circulated along the routes of the Irish missionaries of the seventh century.

But there is no direct evidence for Anglo-Saxon knowledge of *De institutione arithmetica* until the two MSS copies listed above (both from the tenth century). Despite the fact that Bede used Irish sources as a basis for his own computistical works, he does not use Boethian material; Jones states categorically that he "definitely did not use Boethius' mathematical works" (1939 p 49). The Corpus MS suggests that both Celtic and Continental influences were active when this copy was made and that the work was then studied seriously. Bishop (1967 pp 259–62) has argued that the Corpus MS was copied in the mid tenth century, probably at St Augustine's Canterbury, from a Celtic, perhaps a Welsh, exemplar. The MS was laid out for glosses, some of which were copied from the exemplar, some of which were added by various later hands, and its text was collated with at least one and probably several Continental MSS. The Paris MS (from the end of the tenth century) is a more ornamental book and contains also *CONSOLATIO PHILOSOPHIAE* and illustrations but few glosses; it was at St Benoît-sur-Loire (Fleury) and was perhaps written there by an English scribe (White 1981 p 174 and note 67).

#### **De institutione musica** [BOETH.Mus.]: CPL 880.

- MSS 1. Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale 236 (49): HG 784  
 2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 260: HG 72  
 Lists—Refs none.

Like the *ARITHMETICA*, *De institutione musica* became a standard text beginning with the Carolingian revival and was first studied in the same milieu: northern France, then France generally, Germany and the Low Countries (Caldwell 1981 p 143, White 1981 pp 164–68).

Bower's (1988) survey of the extant MSS shows it very well represented in England in the twelfth century (nine MSS, five before around 1160), but extant in only two copies before 1100. The Avranches MS (from the end of the tenth century) was perhaps written by an insular scribe working at Mont Saint Michel; it also contains excerpts from *BEDE* on computus (Bower 1988 p 211). The Cambridge MS (tenth century, Christ Church Canterbury) contains excerpts only of the *Musica* (fols 1–2v, 17–19) along with the

COMMEMORATIO BREVIS DE TONIS ET PSALMIS MODULANDIS and the *MUSICA ET SCOLIA ENCHIRIADIS* (Bower 1988 p 214). Nevertheless Bower's study of the textual tradition of the *Musica* leads him to posit a significant "pre-conquest insular tradition" for this work (p 214).

#### **Geometria**: see CPL 895; see PS BOETHIUS, *ARS GEOMETRIAE ET ARITHMETICAE*.

Although CASSIODORUS testifies that Boethius wrote a geometry, the work does not survive in its original form. Rather, portions of a presumably Boethian translation of Books I–V of Euclid's *Elements* are preserved in four different classes of works: in the third recension of Cassiodorus' *INSTITUTIONES*; in a recension of the Roman *Corpus agrimensorum* (gromatic, or land surveying, texts) which adapted it as a mathematical school book; and in two "geometries," now referred to as *Geom1* (see PS BOETHIUS, *ARS GEOMETRIAE ET ARITHMETICAE*) and *Geom2*, which were widely attributed to Boethius in the MSS. The third recension of Cassiodorus, the adaptation of the Roman gromatic corpus, and *Geom1* have been associated with Corbie and date from the late eighth or ninth century. *Geom2* is dated 1025–50 and originated in Lorraine. (See Folkerts 1970, 1981 and 1982.) All four of these traditions thus contain some material which is apparently genuine Boethius (the Latin translation of Euclid), combined with material from other sources. It is *Geom1* which is preserved in two English MSS of our period.

#### **Consolatio Philosophiae**

##### **Consolatio Philosophiae** [Cons.Phil.]: CPL 878.

- MSS 1. Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus M.16.8: HG 776.  
 2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 214: HG 68.  
 3. Cambridge, Trinity College O.3.7: HG 193.  
 4. Cambridge, University Library Gg.5.35: HG 12.  
 5. Cambridge, University Library Kk.3.21: HG 23.  
 6. El Escorial, Real Biblioteca e.II.1: HG 823.  
 7. Geneva, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana Cod. 175: HG 829.  
 8. London, BL Egerton 267: HG 408.  
 9. Oxford, Bodleian Library Auct. F.1.15 (SC 2455): HG 533.  
 10. Oxford, Corpus Christi College E.74: HG 671.  
 11. Oxford, Merton College 3.12: HG 678.  
 12. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 6401: HG 886.  
 13. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 6401A: HG 887.

14. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 14380: HG 899.
15. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 17814: HG 901.
16. Vatican, Vat. lat. 3363: HG 908.

*Lists* 1. Leofric: ML 10.31 (= MS 9 above).

2. ? Worcester II: ML 11.12.

*A-S Vers* 1. *Bo* (B9.3.2).

2. *Met* (A6).

3. *BoGl* (C9.1).

*Quots/Cits* none: see below.

*Refs* ? *Deor* (A3.20): see below.

The *Consolatio*, written c. 524, first appears in extant MSS of the ninth century, the earliest copy dating from the first quarter of this century (Orléans Bibliothèque Municipale 270, Fleury). Thereafter it was widely copied and circulated; but although it was obviously known in Anglo-Saxon England by Alfred's time, his prose translation (*Bo*) is the earliest certain evidence for knowledge of the work there. ALGUIN knew it and quoted from it (Wallach 1959 pp 64, and 66; and Courcelle 1967 especially pp 39–46), but only in works written after he had left England for the Continent; his *VERSUS DE SANCTIS EUBORICENSIS ECCLESIAE* do not quote from or allude to it, and the books written by Boethius mentioned there (line 1548) probably do not include the *Consolatio* (Godmann 1982 p 124; ML 1.8). As Lapidge says, "it has yet to be demonstrated that the *De consolacione Philosophiae* was known in England before the late ninth century" (ML p 47). According to Lapidge, the Worcester list "presumably (but not necessarily)" refers to the *Consolatio*.

One of the earliest MS copies of the *Consolatio* now extant did make its way to Anglo-Saxon England and may have been there by Alfred's time. The Vatican MS, written in the Loire region in the mid ninth century, has Latin glosses added from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century by several insular hands. The earliest hand is Welsh, Cornish or Southwest English (although it could conceivably have been written on the Continent). Troncarelli (1981 p 204) has suggested that this MS was used by Alfred for his translation and that some of the glosses it contains were written by ASSER; but there is no firm evidence to support this hypothesis (Wittig 1983 p 163 note 20). The MS was almost certainly in southern England by the mid tenth century along with other copies of the *Consolatio*: among several tenth-century glossing hands is one identified as St Dunstan's, and a gloss by this hand indicates that Dunstan was comparing the text of 3363 with that of other copies of the *Consolatio* available to him (Parkes 1981).

Because it is generally agreed that the Old English metrical version of

the meters (*Met*), whether by Alfred or not, was based on the Alfredian prose translation rather than on the Latin *Consolatio*, it does not attest to independent knowledge of the Latin text.

The fifteen surviving MSS of the *Consolatio* written in Anglo-Saxon England amply demonstrate knowledge of the text in the later tenth and eleventh centuries: two are from the second half of the tenth century, nine from around the turn of the eleventh century, and four from the eleventh century. Canterbury has been identified as the source of seven of them (at least two from St Augustine's, two from Christ Church), and two were written at Abingdon. Failure to identify the MS of the *Consolatio* used by Alfred, together with the chance survival of two MS copies in very fragmentary form (BL Egerton and Oxford Merton) and the migration of other MSS from England (Antwerp, El Escorial, Paris), indicate the likelihood that other copies of the *Consolatio* owned or made in Anglo-Saxon England have not survived.

As Glauche (1970) has shown, the *Consolatio* became a "school text," and the surviving English copies argue that this must have been the case in Anglo-Saxon England as well. With one exception (Paris 6401), they all contain at least part of the (Latin) Remigian commentary, some with distinctively English revisions indicating an active process of grappling with the text (see D. Bolton 1978 and see REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE), a process further illustrated by Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 214 which has, in addition to Remigian glosses, interlinear lexical glosses in late West Saxon (*BoGl*).

Markland and W.F. Bolton (GR 3469,5439) have argued that the *Consolatio* 2 (especially Prose 3.34–45) underlies *Deor*. The date of the poem is problematical and the similarities are those of thought rather than obvious verbal echoes; consequently these similarities may have arisen through familiarity with the ideas expressed in the *Consolatio* (e.g. via the prose *Boethius*) rather than from knowledge of the Latin itself.

Joseph S. Wittig

## PS BOETHIUS

*Ars geometriae et arithmeticae* [ANON.Geom.1/PS.BOETH]: *CPL* 895; see also BOETHIUS, GEOMETRIA.

*MSS* 1. Cambridge, Trinity College R.15.3 (939): HG 185.

2. Oxford, Bodleian Library Douce 125 (SC 21699): HG 615.  
*Lists—Refs* none.

The *Ars geometriae et arithmeticae* (Geom1), a treatise in five books, is generally attributed to BOETHIUS in the MSS. As preserved in the 26 extant copies (see Folkerts 1982 pp 95–102), it is an unskillful and sometimes uncomprehending compilation which draws on the gromatic corpus adapted for school use and on the Latin translation of Euclid's Elements, combining these with extracts from Boethius' ARITHMETICA, ISIDORE'S ETYMOLOGIAE, CASSIODORUS' INSTITUTIONES, and the Roman Columella (Folkerts 1981 p 190, and 1982 p 87). It served as a geometry textbook for studying this aspect of the quadrivium.

There is no modern edition of the whole treatise. Migne (*PL* 63.1352D–1364) printed the first two books of Geom1 immediately after Geom2, apparently from the Basel edition of 1546 or 1570, without clear indication that a new work was beginning. *CPL* 895 refers the reader to Bubnov (1899), whose outline of all five books allows one to reconstruct the entire work by page references to Migne and the gromatic and Euclidian texts as printed by Lachmann (1848). Folkerts (1982 pp 88–90) provides a similar outline and reconstruction which also relies on Lachmann for the gromatic texts, but which refers the reader to his own critical editions of the Euclidian translation (Folkerts 1970 pp 173–217) and the "altercatio duorum geometricorum" (Folkerts 1982 pp 103–13).

In the Trinity College copy (tenth century, St Augustine's Canterbury), Geom1 (fols 3–43v) is followed by extracts of other gromatic-geometric material, including excerpts from Isidore and Cassiodorus; the Douce MS (eleventh century, Old Minster Winchester) contains just Geom1. Moreover as Folkerts reconstructs the transmission of Geom1 (1982 p 102), the two copies belong to two separate branches of the textual tradition and so were made quite independently of one another.

Joseph S. Wittig

## CYPRIANUS GALLUS

Virtually nothing is known about the composer of the most expansive versification of the Old Testament from Late Antiquity. Scholars judging from internal evidence generally maintain that the poet was from Gaul and wrote during the first quarter of the fifth century, but even these de-

tails have been disputed. This uncertainty notwithstanding, numerous quotations by early English writers are extant.

### Heptateuchos [CYPR.GALL.Hept.]: *CPL* 1423.

*MSS* Cambridge, Trinity College B.1.42 (40): HG 159.

*Lists—A-S Vers* none.

*Quots/Cits* 1. ALDH.Metr. 92.12: CYPR.GALL.Hept. Iudicum 18.

2. ALDH.Ped.reg. 158.3–5; 189.32: CYPR.GALL.Hept. Iudicum 679–81; Numeri 503.

3. BEDA.Art.Metr. I.17.8–22: CYPR.GALL.Hept. Exodus 507–21.

4. Alcuin.Epist. 260.36–40: CYPR.GALL.Hept. Exodus 129–30.

*Refs* none.

The attribution of the *Heptateuchos* to a Cyprianus does not appear to have been made before the end of the ninth century. ALDHELM and BEDE, for example, cite the work but do not make the attribution. Aldhelm refers to the poet once but only as *ille versificus* (*MGH* AA 15.157). The library catalog of St Riquier, dating from the early ninth century, retains this anonymity. The poem is connected with the name Cyprianus, however, in the catalog of the library at Lorsch dating from the ninth century and in later MSS, including the eleventh-century MS of Canterbury. Herzog (1975 pp 53–60) therefore believes that the name was added in order to give the work greater respectability through association with St Cyprian.

In his metrical *VITA CUTHBERTI*, BEDE echoes this work in the following lines: 152 (Genesis 308); 189 (Genesis 522); 236 (Genesis 286); 516 (Iudicum 469); and 828 (Deuteronomium 54). He also draws on it in lines 62, 439, 545, 662, 729, 736, and 921. Æthelwulf also echoes this work in his *De abbatibus*: 147 (Genesis 327); 280–81 (Genesis 189–90); 413–14 (Exodus 1312–13); 418 (Exodus 1309); 419–20 (Exodus 1317–18); and 646–47 (Exodus 1082–83); see Traube (1888 pp 17–24). Strecker, the editor of the anonymous *Miracula Nynie episcopi*, cites Exodus (827 and 881) for the usage "clepantes" (*MGH* PLAC 4.210).

M. Roberts (1985 pp 94–95) presents a useful summary of the textual history of the *Heptateuchos* in Medieval England as well as on the Continent.

### Deperditorum carminum reliquiae [CYPR.GALL.Carm.rel.]: *CPL* 1424.

*MSS—A-S Vers* none.

*Quots/Cits* ALDH.Metr.80.12: see below.

*Refs* none.

The so-named HEPTATEUCHOS originally treated all the historical

books of the Old Testament. The library catalog of Lorsch, dating from the tenth century, lists the poem of Cyprian on the Heptateuch as well as on Kings, Esther, Judith, and Machabees. The twelfth-century Cluny catalog attributes the *Heptateuchos* to Alchimus and also lists versifications of Kings, Paralipomenon, Esther, Judith, and Machabees.

ALDHELM provides the sole quotation from Regum III; and the CSEL edition of Cyprian also refers to DE METRIS (64.1) for a line from Iob (211.2).

Daniel Nodes

**BLOSSIUS AEMELIUS DRACONTIUS:** DS 3.1706–11; see also ALCUIN, FLORILEGIUM; ANTHOLOGIA LATINA; and EUGENIUS OF TOLEDO, HEX-AEMERON.

Dracontius was a North African poet of the late fifth century. He received a literary education, then studied and practiced law in Carthage. One of his poems from this early period, addressed to a foreign ruler, brought upon him the disfavor of Gunthamund, king of the Vandals in North Africa (484–96). His release came with the help of friends but not before he was interned long enough to write his two Christian poems, the SATISFACTIO and the LAUDES DEI.

These works were well known to English writers. Additionally, in the seventh century a 635-line portion of the first book of the *Laudes Dei* was detached from the work and published separately by EUGENIUS OF TOLEDO in a version showing numerous alterations of the original. In the Middle Ages, this recension became more popular than the original on which it was based and was widely used in the European schools.

Columban, the sixth-century Irish abbot and missionary, also knew Dracontius and quotes amply from his works; see Moussy and Camus (1985 pp 102–03).

**Satisfactio** [DRACONT.Satisfact.]: CPL 1511.

MSS—A-S Vers none.

Quots/Cits ANON.Mir.Nin. 131: DRACONT.Satisfact. 53.

Refs none.

Dracontius wrote the *Satisfactio ad Gunthamundum* as a reparation for the offense he committed against the Vandal king. In the work the poet explains that what caused the offense was Dracontius' celebration of a foreign lord in another poem.

In addition to the quotation of a full line in the anonymous *Miracula S. Nyniae*, ALDHELM echoes two lines of this work (5 and 9) in his CARMEN DE VIRGINITATE (2874–75). Camus (Moussy and Camus 1985 pp 103–04 note 3) notes that line 5 of the *Satisfactio* imitated by Aldhelm is omitted in Eugenius' recension of that work. The CCSL edition of HWÆTBERHT also provides a cross-reference to the *Satisfactio* (5) for AENIGMATA 4.4 (p 214).

**Laudes Dei** [DRACONT.Laud.Dei]: CPL 1509.

MSS—Refs none.

The *Laudes Dei* is a didactic poem in three books totalling over 2,200 hexameters. It treats of God's goodness and merciful forbearance, drawing examples from the Creation, the Incarnation, and God's dealings with the human race.

ALDHELM and BEDE appear to have imitated the *Laudes Dei* frequently. Vollmer's edition (MGH AA 14) connects Aldhelm's CARMEN ECCLESIASTICA IV.vi.7 with *Laudes Dei* II.554. The CCSL edition (vol 133) of Aldhelm's ENIGMATA lists echoes of *Laudes Dei* III.200, and III.137 in ENIGMATA XXXIX.1, and XCI.1.

Among Bede's works the metrical VITA CUTHBERTI (201, 246, 389, 582, and 874) contains echoes of the *Laudes Dei* (II.326, I.516, III.631, I.650, and II.652). DE NATURA RERUM (20.4) echoes *Laudes Dei* II.232. Also, according to Vollmer (p 9 note 14), in Bede's HYMN 14 (*De die iudicii*) verses 49, 115, 133, and 134 echo *Laudes Dei* II.559, I.14, I.7, and I.16. Romano (1959 p 92 notes 243–44) endorses these identifications.

Evans (1968 p 140) cites the listing of *Laudes Dei* in a catalog of the monastic library at Reichenau as evidence of the accessibility of this work to the Continental author of the Old Saxon original of *Genesis B* (*GenB*, A1.1).

Vollmer also connects *Laudes Dei* III.1 with ALCUIN, CARMINA CXXI.1, and *Laudes Dei* III.20 with a letter from Coena (Ethelbert) archbishop of York to Lul (MGH ES 1.262 line 5; see EHD 188). Alcuin composed a florilegium, preserved in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Misc. Patr. 17 (B.II.10), which presents excerpts from books 2 and 3 of *Laudes Dei*. Glauche (1970 p 11) notes the importance of Alcuin's anthology for our knowledge of the use of Dracontius' poems in medieval schools.

**Romulea** [DRACONT.Romul.]: CPL 1513.

MSS—Refs none.

The *Romulea* in Vollmer's *MGH* edition (AA 14) is a collection of ten separate poems on mythological themes. The collective name is derived from a reference to fragments of these poems contained in the *Florilegium Veronense* (Biblioteca Capitolare CLXVIII [155]). The ten poems are extant together only in this one MS; it is not generally held that Dracontius himself considered the poems as a unit.

BEDE's metrical *VITA CUTHBERTI* (57) echoes *Romulea* VIII.401. The *CCSL* edition of ALDHELM's *ENIGMATA* cites echoes of *Romulea* VII.154 in four places: XVI.2-3, XXVI.2, XLII.3, and XLVIII.6

**Orestis tragoedia** [DRACONT.Orest.Trag.]: *CPL* 1514.

*MSS*—*Refs* none.

The *Orestis tragoedia* is a series of short epic pieces, totalling 974 hexameters, on the theme of Orestes' revenge against Clytemnestra for the murder of Agamemnon.

BEDE's metrical *VITA CUTHBERTI* (302, and 584) echoes *Orestis tragoedia* (639, and 158).

Daniel Nodes

## GRAMMARIANS

[This generic entry provides a general introduction to grammatical writings in Anglo-Saxon England, and in the final version will include entries on anonymous grammatical works. In this *Trial Version*, only the entries under ALCUIN and PRISCIAN have been included S.N.]

The evidence for the use of Latin grammars in Anglo-Saxon England falls into two distinct periods: an earlier one, coinciding with the first flowering of Anglo-Latin literature around 700, and a later one which commences with the Benedictine reform movement and covers the latter part of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. In the earlier period our chief source of information is the writings of Anglo-Latin teachers—ALDHELM, TATWINE, BONIFACE, and BEDE. In the later period the evidence is more varied, including manuscripts and booklists as well as grammars by Anglo-Saxon authors. For the intervening period, extending from the second third of the eighth century to the opening of the tenth, source material is scarce. ALCUIN's writings are an uncertain guide, for they may well have been compiled on the Continent (as his *DIALOGUS FRANCONIS ET SAXONIS DE OCTO PARTIBUS ORATIONIS* almost certainly was), and are more likely to reflect

the resources of Frankish rather than those of Anglo-Saxon libraries. (ABBO OF FLEURY's *QUAESTIONES GRAMMATICAE* raise similar difficulties, for Abbo spent only two years at Ramsey, and his replies to the questions put him by the monks are likely to depend upon knowledge he acquired at home. Or are we to imagine that he walked into the library at Ramsey and looked up answers to the questions in books the monks could have consulted for themselves?) It is to be hoped that work on the *fontes* of Anglo-Latin works from this period on subjects other than grammar will help to fill in this gap.

The following discussion surveys the distribution of works dealing with grammar narrowly defined, i.e. with the eight parts of speech. It does not take into account texts on metrics, orthography, or rhetoric.

The introduction of Christianity brought with it the need to learn Latin, the language of the Church. Although the grammars written under the later Roman Empire were themselves diverse and varied, they provided nothing directly designed to help beginners master Latin morphology, a lacuna which medieval teachers filled in many ways. Only a few grammars were widely available in Anglo-Saxon England during the earlier period: DONATUS' *ARS MINOR* and *ARS MAIOR*, PRISCIAN'S *INSTITUTIO DE NOMINE*, and the first book of ISIDORE'S *ETYMOLOGIAE*. Various combinations of works by the following authors could be found at individual centers: ASPER/ASPORIOS, AUDAX, CHARISIUS, CONSENTIUS, DIOMEDES, EUTYCHES, MARTIANUS CAPELLA (Book III), PHOCAS, POMPEIUS, PRISCIAN'S *INSTITUTIONES GRAMMATICAE* and *PARTITIONES*, SERGIUS (PS CASSIODORUS), SERGIUS (DE LITTERA), VICTORINUS, VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS, the ANONYMUS BOBIENSIS, and a lost grammar ascribed to JEROME. To provide a more straightforward introduction to Latin declension and conjugation, Anglo-Saxon teachers made use of compilations of noun and verb paradigms accompanied by copious lists of examples (*Declinationes nominum*) and composed their own introductory grammars (Tatwine, Boniface). Taken to the Continent during the eighth century, these works and most of the ancient grammars studied by the Anglo-Saxons enjoyed a brief vogue until a few decades into the ninth century. The Carolingian renaissance brought with it a change in grammatical and pedagogical fashion. Of the ancient texts, those which were based on material similar to Donatus' grammars, the so-called *Schulgrammatik* genre—Audax, Charisius, Consentius, Diomedes, Victorinus, *Anonymus Bobiensis*—dropped out of favor, as did the commentaries by Pompeius and Sergius (Ps Cassiodorus), along with early medieval attempts at providing instructional material better suited to beginners (Asper/Asporius, *Declinationes nominum*, the elementary grammars). Grammars of *regulae* type (that is, works which set out rules for the identification of particular grammatical forms) like those by Phocas and Eutyches, pseudo-Palaemon and pseudo-Augustine, retained or increased their popularity. But the biggest change